REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The November 6, 2009 Office Action and the Examiner's comments have been carefully considered. In response, an interview was conducted with Examiners Nick Corsaro and Munsoon Choo, claims are amended, and remarks are set forth below in a sincere effort to place the present application in form for allowance. The amendments are supported by the application as originally filed. Therefore, no new matter is added.

INTERVIEW

The courtesy of Examiners Nick Corsaro and Munsoon Choo in granting telephone interviews in connection with this application is acknowledged and appreciated. The interviews took place on November 23, 2009 and December 4, 2009.

During the interviews, the present claimed invention was explained. As a result of the interviews, Examiners Corsaro and Choo agreed that the amendments to claims 1 and 8 discussed as a result of the interviews would more clearly define claims 1 and 8 over the prior art of record and overcome the obviousness rejection set forth in the November 6, 2009 Office Action.

Appln. No. 10/557,107 Amendment dated December 9, 2009 Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2009

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC 102

In the Office Action claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by an International Patent Publication No. WO 02/054803 to Kanerva ("Kanerva"), in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0083411 (Bouthors et al.) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0004333 (Kavanti).

In response, claims 1 and 8 are amended to more clearly define the present claimed invention over the cited references. As discussed with Examiners Corsaro and Choo during the interviews, the present claimed invention as defined by amended claims 1 and 8 now more clearly patentably defines over the applied art, when taken either alone or in combination.

None of the other references of record close the gap between the present claimed invention as defined by amended claims 1 and 8 and Kanerva when taken in combination with Bouthors et al. and Kavanti. Therefore, claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Kanerva, Bouthors et al. and Kavanti, all of the references of record under 35 USC 102 as well as 35 USC 103.

Claims 2-7 are either directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, and are patentable over the cited references in view of their dependence on claim 1 and because the references do not disclose, teach of suggest each of the limitations set forth in claims 2-7.

Appln. No. 10/557,107 Amendment dated December 9, 2009 Reply to Office Action of November 6, 2009

In view of all of the foregoing, claims 1-8 are in form for immediate allowance, of which action is earnestly solicited.

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out where there is support for a contrary view.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted

Ribert R. Michal Reg. No. 35,614

Dated: December 9, 2009

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.

220 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10001-7708

Tel. (212) 319-4900 Fax (212) 319-5101